# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

$D \wedge D D \wedge D \wedge$	SUE McCLELLAN.
BAKBAKA	SUE MICULELLAN.

Plaintiff,

v. Case. No. 12-11139

Hon. Lawrence P. Zatkoff

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

Defendant.		

## **OPINION AND ORDER**

AT A SESSION of said Court, held in the United States Courthouse, in the City of Port Huron, State of Michigan, on March 6, 2013

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE LAWRENCE P. ZATKOFF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff filed this action seeking disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income under the Social Security Act. This matter currently comes before the Court on the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation [dkt 14], in which the Magistrate Judge recommends that Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment [dkt 8] be denied and Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment [dkt 12] be granted. Plaintiff has filed objections to the Magistrate's Report and Recommendation [dkt 15]. Defendant has not yet responded to Plaintiff's objections and the Court determines that such response is unnecessary at this time. The Court has thoroughly reviewed the court file, the respective motions, the Report and Recommendation, and Plaintiff's objections. For the reasons discussed below, the Court ADOPTS the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment is DENIED, and Defendant's Motion

for Summary Judgment is GRANTED. The Court will, however, briefly address Plaintiff's objections.

## II. LEGAL STANDARD

The Court examines an ALJ's decision to determine if the correct legal standard was used and if the findings are supported by substantial evidence. Key v. Callahan, 109 F.3d 270, 273 (6th Cir. 1997). The ALJ's decision "is not subject to reversal, even if there is substantial evidence in the record that would have supported an opposite conclusion, so long as substantial evidence supports the conclusion reached by the ALJ." Id. Substantial evidence is "more than a scintilla of evidence but less than a preponderance and is such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion." Brainard v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs., 889 F.2d 679, 681 (6th Cir. 1989). In determining whether the Commissioner's decision is supported by substantial evidence, the Court must examine the administrative record as a whole. Cutlip v. Sec'v of Health & Human Servs., 25 F.3d 284, 286 (6th Cir. 1994) (per curiam). The Court may not try the case de novo, resolve conflicts in evidence, or decide questions of credibility. Bass v. McMahon, 499 F.3d 506, 509 (6th Cir. 2007). If the Commissioner's decision was supported by substantial evidence and decided under the correct legal standard, the Court must affirm the Commissioner's decision even if it may decide the case differently, and even if substantial evidence also supports the claimant's position. *Mullen v. Bowen*, 800 F.2d 535, 545 (6th Cir. 1986) (en banc).

# III. ANALYSIS

Plaintiff raises two main objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. In her objections, Plaintiff disputes the ALJ's weighing of the evidence, objects to the Magistrate Judge's failure to adopt Plaintiff's views in that regard, and claims that the ALJ is biased. But, Plaintiff's objections to the Report and Recommendation repeat—at times verbatim—the same

2:12-cv-11139-LPZ-CEB Doc # 16 Filed 03/06/13 Pg 3 of 3 Pg ID 934

arguments raised in her Motion for Summary Judgment. Plaintiff's objections—and arguments

asserted in her motion—are devoid of any facts or law demonstrating that the ALJ failed to apply

the correct legal standard or made findings of fact unsupported by substantial evidence in the record,

see Key, 109 F.3d at 273, or demonstrate that the ALJ is somehow biased. In sum, the ALJ showed,

and the Magistrate Judge acknowledged, that substantial evidence existed to support the ALJ's

conclusions.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment

[dkt 8] is DENIED, and Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment [dkt 12] is GRANTED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

S/Lawrence P. Zatkoff

LAWRENCE P. ZATKOFF

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Date: March 6, 2013